

The Western Seminary Bulletin

REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA

VOL. III, NO. 4

HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

MARCH, 1950

The Biblical Teaching on Church and State

JOHN A. VANDER WAAL

The perplexing problems of the world recur in history. One of the persistent questions of the Christian era has been that concerning the relationship between the Christian Church and the secular state. That relationship has seldom been clearly explicated in the minds of men. The Roman Catholic and the traditional Protestant views expressing this relationship have differed widely and again today the problem is occupying the attention of many in the Western world. To what extent the thoroughly secularized state may press its authority, to whom, if any, the state is morally responsible, and in what relationship it stands to the Kingdom of God are moot questions and an inquiry into the Biblical teaching on Church-state relationships is, by all means, warranted.

A systematic presentation of the question is not to be ascertained in the Bible. We may as well put up with the fact that the writers of Scripture were no Aristotelians and busied themselves less with theoretical outlining of doctrine than with the setting forth of divine truth in concrete, historical situations. This situation obtains with respect to the Church and state relationships. That there is Biblical information apropos to the subject cannot, fortunately, be denied; but that this information is irregularly unfolded must, on the other hand, be asserted. Rightly to divide the Scripture for its word of truth on a rather obscure relationship has been posited as the task for this inquiry. Certain positive teachings, it is hoped, may be adduced as the result.

There is a distinction in the Bible, first of all, between the nation and the state. These two are frequently confused in our thinking. Scripture recognizes the reality, plurality, and diversity of nations. The *locus classicus scripturae* for the doctrine of nationality is Acts 17:26, "And he made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation" (A.R.V.). Are nations of the order of creation or of the order of the fall? It is hardly conceivable from the Biblical data that national differences existed from the very beginning. No Biblical text can be found supporting the view that national distinctions were willed by God as the immediate consequence of creation.¹ Rather significantly, the existence of national groups is not discovered before the story of the tower of Babel in Gen. 11. Although it may not be possible to base the multiplicity of the nations solely on this story, it can be assumed with certainty that the existence of nations is not mentioned until after the flood. The fact of the plurality of nations appears to be, at least indirectly, related to the order of the fall. The historical development of nations is also represented as being

subject to God's control. God shapes the destinies of the nations. He calls a nation into being, gives it a mission, and as the Lord of history, he controls its historical destiny. The rise and abasement of nations is in his hands. God exercises his sovereignty as much when he calls a nation into existence as when he causes it to decline (Job 12:23). For the Biblical writers, nations, like individuals, are mortal (Isa. 40:17).

The scriptural view of nationality may be summarized by stating that the plurality of nations and their differing character are realities. The diversity of the nations stems from the unity of the race, whereas the calling into being, the historical growth and decay, and the ultimate fate of all the nations are subject to the control of the Lord of all the world. The Church consists of those who have been called out from the nations; and, ideally, all national distinctions are abrogated in Christ. Actually, national barriers are never invalidated. It is only as a matter of faith that they are broken down by the factual existence of the Christian Church which embraces all the nations.²

Our chief interest in this study is not the nation but the state and the Church's relationship to it. We shall examine the Old Testament for its bearing upon the subject. What does the Old Testament teach about the origin of the state? Is the state inherent in creation or is it one of the direct consequences of the fall? E. Stauffer directs us to the fact that there was in the Oriental World of Old Testament days the prevalent idea that governments and states were instituted by God as bulwarks against the powers of chaos.³ He states that according to this view the world-states perform the function of warding off threatened destruction.⁴ Whether or not the Old Testament shares in this idea is not perfectly clear. Perhaps the closest parallels in the Old Testament to the well-known New Testament passage of Rom. 13:1-7 are Dan. 4:17, 32, and Jer. 27:5. These furnish us with the best Old Testament clues to the origin of political power and Dodd suggests that the view that secular governments were of divine institution was an orthodox doctrine in Judaism.⁵ At any rate, world powers are recognized as realities and the possibility exists that a given power may act in utter self-interest and irresponsibility. Therein lies the danger of the state.

In what perspective does the Old Testament view the state? Perhaps the principal teaching concerning the state in the Old Testament is that it is subject to the sovereignty of God. This is true for both the Israelitish and the pagan states. No earthly power exists merely for itself, nor does it possess unlimited, autocratical power to do as it pleases. When a great world power

The Western Seminary Bulletin

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE
FACULTY OF THE SEMINARY
HOLLAND, MICHIGAN

EDITORIAL BOARD

LESTER J. KUYPER, Faculty Representative
D. IVAN DYKSTRA, Alumni Representative
JOHN A. VANDER WAAL, Student Representative



oversteps itself and uses ruthless methods in the accomplishment of selfish purposes, it becomes subject to the judgment of God. Time and again the prophets speak of impending judgment by God and imminent destruction of world-states. The Old Testament is unequivocal in its viewpoint that world-states are subject to God's control.

Not only are the world-states restrained in their wrong intentions by the rule of God, but they also are morally responsible for the right use of authority bestowed upon them by God. The Old Testament looks upon no world-state as autonomous and irresponsible but as somehow subject to the divine moral law. From what sources the world powers derive knowledge of this divine law is a question with which the Old Testament does not concern itself. Somehow they have such knowledge and for that reason the prophets are not hesitant to hurl imprecations and speak strong words of judgment against the world powers of the day. Amos feels perfectly justified in denouncing Damascus because "they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" (1:3; A.V.). The world-states, although subordinate to God's control, are thereby not relieved of responsibility to divine law.

A third perspective under which the Old Testament views the state is that in which God is represented as using the world-powers for his own purposes. Rulers are made to secure the purposes of God, even unwittingly. An outstanding illustration of this truth is recorded in Jer. 27:6, "And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field also have I given him to serve him" (A.R.V.). Strikingly enough, Nebuchadnezzar is here designated as the servant of God. Specific rulers may be raised up for special purposes. In Isa. 45:1 Cyrus is named the anointed of God and in v. 13 God's vindicating righteousness is the reason behind his action in raising up Cyrus. These are just a few instances of the truth that God uses the powers that be for his own ends. Knowingly or not, they are beneath his higher hand. The Old Testament looks upon world-states as instruments of God for the working out of his purposes.

We have somehow become accustomed to the thought that the actual problem of Church-state relations does not arise in the Old Testament. We are confronted with a theocracy and a theocracy means precisely the identification of civil and spiritual powers. The Old Testament theocracy cannot serve as a model for the present day and, having reached that conclusion, we usually dismiss the subject. But though the ideal of the Hebrew nation was a theocratic government, the ideal was seldom if ever realized in actual practice. It was at this point that the prophet became relevant. Almost inversely proportional to the extent of the failure of the Hebrew kingdom to realize the theocratic ideal was the earnestness with which the prophetic witness was rendered. Ezekiel is set as a watchman to the house of Israel (3:17 and 33:7), and in Isaiah God says that he has set watchmen upon the walls of Jerusalem, who shall not hold their peace (62:6). The content of the prophetic witness to the state in the Old Testament is well summed up in Jer. 22:3: "Thus saith the Lord; Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless, nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place" (A.V.).

The principles which the Old Testament sets forth on the relationship between the Church and state may now be summarized. The Old Testament has little to say about the divine origin or the theoretical function of the state, as such. In the utterances of some of the prophets, and especially in the Book of Daniel, the world-state seems to have an apocalyptic destiny. The ideal for the Hebrew nation itself is that of a theocracy but the concrete history of this nation demonstrates only partial realization of the ideal. When the divine will for the Hebrew theocracy was being imperfectly expressed, the prophet was raised to serve as the conscience of the state. The prophet, in his rightful capacity, witnessed against the state and interpreted the divine law for the state. The Old Testament does not teach the autonomy and the moral and spiritual irresponsibility of either the Hebrew state or the great world-states. Explicitly, little is taught about our subject in the Old Testament. Implicitly, as may be seen from the above, much can be inferred.

In the New Testament circumstances of a radically different nature are encountered. An entirely new question—one of the profoundest in history, according to Ernest Barker⁶—was precipitated when a small community of people professing the true faith was obliged to live in another, larger community professing a false one.⁷ The New Testament does speak to the question but we are presuming too much if we expect comprehensive and detailed information on all the implications.

One of the foremost teachings of the New Testament concerning the state is that it is instituted by God. This is the unambiguous meaning of the *locus classicus* of Scripture for the doctrine of the state, Rom. 13:1-7, "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (13:1b; A.V.). The doctrine is simply declared, without any reference to the question whether the existing powers are godless or God-fearing, heathen or Christian.⁸ Every throne is a throne of God's

grace. To the state, out of the demands of the historical situation, God has given the power of the sword (13:4). From the New Testament viewpoint the state is ordained by God, arises out of the practical necessities of emergency world-conditions, and wields its power by means of the sword entrusted to it by God.

What can be said about the function of the state? It is oftentimes assumed that the function of the state is purely negative. The state exists for the purpose of restraining evil, preserving order, and the punishment of evildoers. This is the negative aspect but certainly the New Testament teaching is not limited to that. The state has a positive function, as well. It exists in order to encourage the good and promote the well-being of its citizens (Rom. 13:4a; I Pet. 2:14b). But the state has a still more dramatic function than either of the two just mentioned. This third function of the state renders it necessary in our present world-order for warding off the war with chaos. The state operates as a restraining influence against the "mystery of iniquity" and is the providential instrument by which its full manifestation is hindered (II Thess. 2:6ff).

Insofar as the destiny of the state is concerned, one or two things may be prudently written. The state which the New Testament has before its eyes is not destined to remain forever. Allusion may again be made to II Thess. 2:7ff, where the tragic consummation of the political powers of the world is indicated. The state-powers must at last succumb to the chaos-powers. In their struggle with demonic forces the state-powers shall ultimately be conquered. The state then plays an opposite role in history. Whereas it once constituted the bulwark against the Antichrist, it now becomes the stronghold of the Antichrist (Rev. 13:14ff).

The state has been considered in itself, without reference to its actual relationship to the Christian Church. What can be discovered in the New Testament about that relationship? The attitude of the Christian to the Empire was to be one of obedience and subjection wherever and whenever possible. That is clearly taught in Rom. 13:1-7; and Christ himself teaches it in Mark 12:14-17, Matt. 22:15-22, and Luke 20:21-25. In I Tim. 2:1, 2, and Titus 3:1 Christians are exhorted to pray for the rulers of the civil power. Meanwhile, the New Testament Church existed within an Empire which, though at first rather tolerant of the Christian communities, was bound, in the very nature of the case, eventually to become their persecutor. There is sufficient evidence to believe that I Peter was composed during a time of persecution, whether general or local and sporadic, and the letter itself has frequently been designated as a "persecution document." Despite the conditions of persecution which may have been generally prevalent and extremely severe, the Christians are counselled to continue to submit to the higher powers and to evaluate their own sufferings in the light of Christ's (2:13-17; 4:12-16). The man who was persecuted because he was a Christian was to be considered happy. Thus the main line of New Testament teaching is consistent in its demands that Christians subject themselves to the state. However, as the persecutions were increased and intensified, it was inevitable that the Church came in time to distinguish between its area of rightful obedience to the state and that of its necessary disobedience. In the

Book of Revelation the state is viewed from an entirely different perspective. Conditions now are almost intolerable for many of the churches and the seats of power are equated with the seat of Satan (chap. 2).

It is apparent from the foregoing that the attitude of the Church towards the duly constituted authorities of state passes from one of respect and regard to one of contempt and horror. This does not mean that the New Testament ever encourages resistance to the state. No specific point is designated beyond which the Church need not go in its obedience to the state. The New Testament can neither be construed as teaching "the right divine of kings to rule" nor as encouraging active opposition to the state on the part of Christian subjects, much less open rebellion. A doctrine of passive obedience to the state is not found in the New Testament. By the same token, the right of Christians to resist, rebel, or revolt is scarcely ascertainable, even though the state engages in extreme persecuting measures. This leads us to believe that a tension exists in the New Testament between state and Church, a tension which, if it is not readily discernible on its pages, is hidden just behind the lines and becomes especially acute in times of duress. The early Church did not maintain a merely static and passive relationship to the state. Rather, a tension exists, one which the realism of the New Testament does not avoid nor ignore, and it is probable that a similar tension must exist in every age.

What justification does the New Testament allow for the view that Church and state operate in two distinct spheres and, consequently, that their realms of activity are mutually exclusive? Is the one concerned only with things spiritual and the other with things temporal? There is ample basis for insisting that Church and state must be functionally separated. The Church is never warranted in assuming, nor even desiring to assume, the functional activity of the state. An assumption of the duties of the state by the Church is not upheld, even as the remotest utopian ideal, in the New Testament. Neither is the state qualified to proclaim the Gospel of God's forgiveness in Christ. A certain departmentalization rightfully exists in Church and state relationships. Side by side, they must exist, with little or no actual functional interpenetration between them.

The functional independence of Church and state should not delude us into thinking that each is absolutely autonomous in its own realm. If that be true, the Church can at no time check any action of the state. The realms of the political and the spiritual, having no contact with each other, in time may exchange not so much as a passing glance. The door to the absolutizing of politics is left wide open! But one of the strongest New Testament teachings is that of Christ's Lordship over all things. He is Lord not only of the Church but also of the world. His redemptive work has made an objective difference both within the Church and outside it. Col. 2:15 represents him as having scored an open triumph over principalities and powers. The work of redemption, accomplished by him, has a bearing upon every realm of life. There is simply no sphere of secular activity that does not fall under his scrutiny and his Lordship. The standard adopted by the German Confessional Church in 1934 is apposite here: "We reject the false doctrine that there are spheres of life in which

we belong, not to Jesus Christ, but to other masters; realms where we do not need to be justified and sanctified by Him."⁹ Can this be interpreted as meaning that the state is to be subordinated, even spiritually, to the Church? Of course not. The New Testament teaches a divine, in distinction from an ecclesiastical, jurisdiction over the world. Rather, it seems to mean that the state does perform a service in the revealed Kingdom of God. The redemptive effects of the work of Christ are extensive and the state, even if it once belonged to the scheme of nature, now performs a service within the scheme of grace. Within the context of Christ's Kingship over the world, any tendency towards a fundamental dualism between the realms of the Church and state is eliminated. The concept of the state formulated by the New Testament tends to be Christocentric.

There are two extremes to be avoided in our thinking about Church and state. The first consists in confusing the rule of Christ over the state with the rule of the Church over the state. The second consists in separating absolutely the two realms as though they have nothing to do with each other. Protestantism, traditionally, has been more guilty of the latter. Correct thinking proceeds from the realization that the state is related to the order of salvation. A type of theocratic thinking about the state may be legitimately revived today. The state is not called upon to acknowledge the supremacy of the Church over its own life but the state is called upon to recognize the Kingship of Christ even within its life. The history of salvation makes a difference to the state. This conception cuts across the popular distinctions between nature and grace and forbids that the state be abandoned by the Church as a hopeless cause, belonging to a fallen order. The state stands related to the revealed Kingdom of God. The New Testament ideal is not ecclesiocracy but Christocracy.¹⁰

In the light of the foregoing, it is evident that Church and state have certain reciprocal duties. The state is to maintain conditions which will guarantee freedom and peace to the Church. But the state is not fulfilling its highest function merely when it secures favorable external conditions for the life of the Church. It is a means of grace to the state that the Church exists within her borders. With that consciousness, the state, being under the Kingship of Christ, has no right to commit itself to an official religion other than Christianity. The Church, on the one hand, exists within the state as one institution among many, and as such is an earthly institution having a certain form; the Church, on the other hand, is in the land as the representative of God's redemptive purpose and by faith learns the secret divine will, even for the state (Eph. 1:9, 10). The Church, then, does have a prerogative within the state and despite the fact that it does not compel its will and decisions upon the state, it may legitimately render a positive, prophetic witness to the state. It is concerned about the form of its own life within the state and is anxious that political conditions are maintained that will enable men to serve the state in a Christian way. Actually, the task of the Church, in the words of De Quervain, is "to understand the state better than it understands itself."¹¹

A summary of the foregoing remarks shows that the New Testament lays down no formulated doctrine of the Christian state, prescribes no specific form of gov-

ernment for the state, devises no set limits to the respective jurisdiction of Church and state, and dictates no final solution to the modern problem of separation of Church and state. Without doubt, however, the New Testament conceives of the state as having a theological foundation, as being under the Kingship of Christ, and as related to his redemptive work. A somewhat dialectical view of the state is presented, in that the New Testament can pass from a positive to a very negative view of the state, but this is no refutation of the idea that the state has a place in the service of the revealed Kingdom of God. New Testament writers were convinced of the Kingship of Christ and of his right to rule all the world but they wrote under the tension of their own concrete, historical situations. They did not conceive of a day when the Church should rule the world but they expected that the Christian Church should, by prophetic word and priestly intercession, make known the Will of their King to the state. The word of Church-state relationships that will satisfy the demands of every age has not been written but the teaching of the Scripture cannot be regarded tenuously.

1. Hans Lilje, "Church and Nation," in *Church and Community* (The Official Oxford Conference Books, Vol. V. Willett, Clark, and Co., 1938), p. 101.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
3. *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1948), p. 64.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
5. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1932), p. 203.
6. Essay on "Church and Community," in *Church and Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
7. John Baillie, *What Is Christian Civilization?* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), p. 7.
8. E. Stauffer, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
9. Quotation from essay entitled "The State and Divine Law," by W. A. Whitehouse (*Reformation Old and New*; Edited by F. W. Camfield. London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), p. 200.
10. W. A. Visser 'tHooft, *The Kingship of Christ* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1948), p. 131.
11. Quotation from W. A. Visser 'tHooft, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

Writers In This Issue

John A. Vander Waal is a member of the senior class. His classmate, Thomas M. Groome, Jr., prepared the Alumni News and the Seminary Highlights.

Wynand Wichers is former president of Hope College and now vice-president of Western Michigan College of Education at Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Willem L. Ietswaart, '48, is doing graduate work for the doctorate degree at Princeton Seminary. He hails from Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Theodore Schaap, '35, is pastor of Unity Church, Muskegon, Michigan.

D. Ivan Dykstra, '38, is a member of Hope College faculty.

William Goulouze is a member of the seminary faculty.

Separation of Church and State in the United States

WYNAND WICHERS

The principle of the separation of church and state is a unique American contribution to religious and political history.

Of all the differences between the Old World and the New, this is perhaps the most salient . . . here is no Established Church, and all religions are equal before the law and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens.¹

This was not the case, however, in our early history. In general, there was no separation of church and state in the colonial period. Even as late as 1770, there were state supported churches in nine of the colonies. In Virginia, the Church of England was established from 1607 to 1776. The law recognized only the licensed religion, and all settlers were required to pay taxes for the support of the clergy. In Massachusetts, the Puritans attempted to set up a Calvinistic theocracy and banished all heretics from the realm. In Maryland, the Charter granted to Lord Calvert in 1632 provided that the church law of England was to be enforced. And in New York, first the Reformed Church and later the Anglican received the favor of the government. One of the exceptions to the general rule was Rhode Island where the Charter recognized complete separation of church and state.

Such a situation in the early period was perfectly natural, since the colonists brought with them the European tradition of religion and education. But the traditional European patterns were not adequate for the conditions in a new world. For many reasons, the principle of religious freedom found fertile soil, and the leaders in American life and thought were determined that the church and state relationship of Europe should not be established here. They feared religious tyranny as much as they did political. And so by the time of the American Revolution, the fact of our religious diversity and the growing idea of separation had begun to reduce the number of state-supported churches. In 1785, Virginia disestablished the English Church in that State.² Other states took similar action and by 1833 the principle of separation had been written not only into the Federal Constitution but also into nearly all the State Constitutions. A wall of separation had been built between the government and the church. This wall is essential to the independence of religion and the church.

The basic guarantees, coming out of the common will of the people, are found in the Federal Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court in numerous decisions. The First Amendment prevents the Congress from making any law respecting an established religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Does this amendment separate church and state? Thomas Jefferson was certain of it. Said he,

I contemplate with solemn reverence that act of the whole American people which declares that their Legislature should make no law respecting an establishment of religion, . . . thus building a wall of separation between church and state.³

The Supreme Court has removed all doubt of it in the recent cases before it. The words of Mr. Justice Black

in the *Champaign School* decision are clear as crystal. In the *Everson Bus Case*, both the majority and the minority were agreed that the language of the First Amendment, properly interpreted, had created a wall of separation which must be kept high and impregnable.⁴ The prohibitions put upon the Congress by the First Amendment were made binding upon the States by the Fourteenth Amendment. These two are the cornerstones in the wall of separation. The wall is there. The only questions that can arise relate to what the wall separates. Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Champaign Case* said,

We are all agreed that the First and the Fourteenth Amendments have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of government than merely to forbid an "established church." But agreement, in the abstract . . . does not preclude a clash of opinions as to what the wall separates.⁵

In recent years there have been many such clashes of opinion, particularly in the area of education. Here the exact lines between the interests of the church and the interests of the state are most difficult of definition. And it is in these areas that the most formidable attacks upon the wall occur. Those, who in defiance of the Constitution would use the public schools for the teaching of sectarian religion, are often found in the same camp with the advocates of public support for sectarian education.

In colonial days there were common schools of various types.⁶ In time, Latin Grammar Schools and Academies began to take their place in the scheme of things. And then the public school was born. After a long and bitter fight, under the leadership of men like Horace Mann and Henry Barnard, a non-sectarian, tax-supported school system for all children was established. The growth of this new institution was most rapid in the great, new West where education did not have to separate itself from sectarian domination as it did in New England and in the Middle Colonies. The Constitution of Connecticut in 1818 had laid down the basic principle that school funds in the State were to be inviolably appropriated to the support and encouragement of public schools and no law should be made authorizing said funds to be diverted to any other use than the public schools.⁷ When the Western States sought admission to the Union, they followed this general pattern. In 1876, Congress required every State seeking admission, to write into its Constitution a requirement that it maintain a school system "free from sectarian control." Public education, free for all children and free from control by the churches, became a fundamental concept in our democratic life. But the principle of religious freedom and the language of the Constitution also mean that private and sectarian schools may be operated without interference by the state as long as they are privately controlled and supported.

In respect to public education, what does our historic commitment to the wall of separation mean? The *Champaign School Case* makes it clear that the schools may not be used to promote sectarian religion. In 1940, leaders of Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant groups

formed an association called the Champaign Council on Religious Education. The Council obtained permission from the Board of Education to offer classes in religious instruction to public school pupils whose parents asked for the privilege. Classes met in the public schools and were taught in separate religious groups. Objection was made to the practice, and the case came to the Supreme Court for decision in 1948. The vote was eight to one. The majority of the Court held that the Champaign "released time" plan was in violation of the principle of separation of church and state. Mr. Justice Black said,

The foregoing facts . . . show the use of tax-supported property for religious instruction and the close cooperation between the school authorities and the religious council in promoting religious education. The operation of the state's compulsory education system thus assists and is integrated with the program of religious instruction carried on by separate religious sects . . . And it falls squarely under the ban of the First Amendment (made applicable to the States by the Fourteenth).⁸

The Court, for the first time, denied the validity of this type of "released time" program in which teachers of religion come into the public school and hold classes there.

Does this decision also prohibit types of "dismissed time" programs where children leave the public school for certain periods to go to their churches for religious instruction? Such plans have been in operation in Gary, Indiana, since 1914, and in New York since 1941. In these plans, religious teaching is not done on the premises, and the school takes no part in the conduct of the church school. So far, the Supreme Court has not been called upon for a judicial decision. There could be the legal question whether the Board of Education can lawfully substitute a period of religious instruction away from the school for a period of schoolroom instruction under the compulsory attendance laws of the state. It does not follow, however, that such "dismissed time" programs would fall under the same ban as the Champaign "released time" plan which was held to be in violation of the principle of separation. The "dismissed time" advocates can take comfort from the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter who, in the Champaign Case, reviews the whole history of released time and says,

Insofar as these are manifestations merely of the free exercise of religion, they are quite outside the scope of judicial concern . . . It is only when challenge is made to the share that the public schools have in the execution of a particular "released time" program that close judicial scrutiny is demanded of the exact relation between the religious instruction and the public educational system in the specific instances before the Court.⁹

Separation of church and state does not forbid cooperation but this cooperation may not be extended to the point of union.

It would appear that in some areas of education the Court holds the wall of separation to be high and impregnable. But what does the Court say about the use of public funds for the benefit of persons in private and parochial schools? Until about 1930, State Courts had always held that no public funds could be diverted from the public schools. Since that time, many States have appropriated public funds to provide certain services to children in religious schools, such as health, free lunches, free textbooks and transportation. In 1930, a citizen of Louisiana brought suit to bar the use of such funds in his State for the purchase of textbooks for children in religious schools. When the case finally came to

the Supreme Court, the Court held this to be no violation of the principle of separation. Chief Justice Hughes said,

When books furnished for private schools were granted not to the schools themselves but only to or for the use of children, and when the books were the same as those furnished for public schools, not being religious or secular, there is no violation of the 14th Amendment.¹⁰

More recently, in the *Everson Bus Case*, the Court has upheld the validity of the laws in certain States which allow the use of public monies to provide free transportation for all children in private as well as in public schools. The majority and minority of the Court agreed that

No tax in any amount large or small can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion, . . . but the Constitution also provides that citizens may not be hampered in the free exercise of their own religion and therefore could not exclude anyone because of his faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation.¹¹

The result has been that in more than twenty States, the Constitution or the Statutes permit the transportation of parochial pupils at public expense.

It would appear that here are the beginnings of possible breaches in the wall of separation. The camel has his nose in the tent. Powerful religious interests want to go on from here and are now exerting pressures on the Congress to vote direct aid for all schools—parochial as well as public. The Roman Catholic Church never has accepted the principle of separation, except as a temporary *modus vivendi*. The Church teaches that in the perfect State, the Catholic religion should be established and supported by public taxation.¹² The Syllabus of Pius IX in 1864 condemned all non-Catholic schools and all Catholics that made use of them.¹³ Therefore, we should not be surprised at efforts in behalf of direct support for their schools. There was introduced into the 79th Congress the Mead-Aiken Bill, designed to authorize the distribution of federal funds to public schools as well as to non-public schools. In the 80th Congress, the McCowan Bill in the House and the Taft Bill in the Senate attempted to avoid the direct use of public funds by the provision that the appropriation should be distributed by each State in accordance with its own statutes. In the last Congress, the Barden Bill died in the House Labor and Education Committee because of strong Catholic opposition. In hearings before the Committee, they urged the defeat of the Bill because it made no provision for parochial schools. The opposition to the Bill made it quite clear that they are determined to accomplish their purpose either "by gaining an unconstitutional subsidy for a system of rival schools, or by blocking all federal aid to public education."¹⁴ I believe that Johnson is quite right in declaring that the passage of such an Act as the Taft Bill and the defeat of the Barden Bill

would not only threaten the public schools but raise a political and religious issue in every State. It would intensify sectarian intolerance, create a scramble for public funds and divide society into political and sectarian camps which the Constitution was designed to prevent.¹⁵

For a long time separation has been a fundamental concept of government. Rooted deep in the thinking and feeling of our people, guaranteed by the Constitution, it is still not without organized opposition. All Protestants have a high stake in the matter. All of us must

defend the principle of separation lest religious freedom also suffer.

The first step in the strategy of defense is to preserve public education and to keep it free from sectarian control. The public schools were born in a period of great sectarian conflict. This was one of the reasons why the founders were determined to bar sectarian teaching. They wished to avoid the complete fusion of secular and religious interests. This did not indicate any decline in the religion of the people. Its claims were not minimized by refusing to make public schools agencies for the assertion of particular beliefs. Designed to serve as perhaps the most powerful agency for promoting cohesion among many groups and many faiths, the school must be kept free from entanglements in the strife of sects.¹⁶

There are those who say the schools are God-less. The government is not God-less because it allows no State church. It protects all religions equally—appoints chaplains for the armed services, opens its legislative session with prayer, etc. Neither is secular education God-less. Public education is not anti-religious but anti-sectarian. One-half of the States require the reading of the Bible, and many more permit it. In the schools are men and women teachers, active in their churches, trying in every possible way to combine religion with secular culture. There are strong, moral, and spiritual emphases in social science, music, and literature which help to nourish a religious culture. Nor can the school be charged with the responsibility for our modern secularism. Public schools are a little more than a century old. Our modern secularism had its origin in the Renaissance. The public school has been the great melting pot in America. Its work has been magnificent in spite of great problems and much opposition. Probably the schools are less religious than they ought to be. It may be that we ourselves are responsible because we have been more interested in promoting our own particular type of belief than in the study of a common core of Christian faith and practice. As Weigle says, "The common religious faith of the American people as distinguished from the sectarian forms in which it is organized may rightfully be assumed and find appropriate expression in the life and work of the public schools."¹⁷

In the second place, we can help to maintain this wall of separation by refusing to make alliance with those who would compel the government to subsidize private and parochial schools. In America, such schools may operate as coordinate with the public schools because the fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the state to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only.¹⁸

Under the Constitution, such schools may be operated without any interference from the state, but without the support of the state. Whether or not a dual system of schools is necessary or advisable for the safeguard of religion in America is debatable. The proponents of religious day schools should, however, frankly recognize that these schools can serve only a very limited purpose, since they can provide education for the children of their respective parishes alone. Conceivably, we could have in this country as many varieties of parochial schools as there are different churches and sects. This could only result in educational chaos which would weaken the foundation of our democracy and in such sectarian strife

as would be reminiscent of the religious quarrels in Europe and in the early colonies. In this respect, the Catholic Church has the advantage over Protestantism because of the unity of its program and the absolutism of its control. But if, in the interest of education, we break down the wall of separation between church and state, we are also in grave danger of destroying the guarantees of religious freedom.

But there is a still better line of defense, and that is for the Christian churches to take the teaching function of the church much more seriously. We have been altogether too willing to shoulder upon the public schools all responsibility for duties that belong to the home and church. This has made its own contribution to the secularism of our age and the suspicion now directed against the school. There are some specific things we can do.

1. We must re-examine the program and results of the Sunday School. Its facilities and teaching method are often antiquated and in few instances have we kept pace with the advance made in the content and method of public school education.

2. We should strive as far as we can to put religion back into the school. The founders of our republic, the signers of the Constitution, and the leaders of the public schools never intended to divorce religion from education. They did not wish to bar religion from the schools, but they were determined to avoid sectarian teaching. But American sectarians could not agree on a common core of religious truth to be taught, and therefore must accept some of the blame for a situation against which they now protest. If churches cannot agree on what the essential meaning of religion is, we cannot expect the state to do it. In many States, the Bible can be put back into the schools since education is a matter of State control. And it is possible to develop cooperative "dismissed time" programs in each community. The Supreme Court has not yet passed on the validity of such programs. Again we should be much more eager to cooperate with leaders in American education in a real study of the problem. The American Council on Education is much concerned with it and has already laid the groundwork for a real approach. And there is the International Council on Religious Education whose work offers great promise. It has already established a Committee on Religious and Public Education and will shortly have a full-time director. We can take satisfaction in the fact that in both systems of education are leaders who are deeply concerned. This concern offers hope if approached in a cooperative spirit.

This paper has been concerned almost altogether with the educational aspect of the relationship of church and state. There are many other tensions and threats to the principle of separation. But the most vicious attacks on the wall recently have been those discussed here. If this line can be held and this battle won, we shall have better hope for the preservation of a principle which is historic and which is fundamental to all our religious liberty. Separation of church and state is one of Protestantism's great contributions to America. We must guard it well.

1. James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, Volume II (third edition: 1859), p. 695.
2. William Seiler, "The Church of England in 17th Century Virginia," *Journal of Southern History*, November, 1949.

3. Johnson and Yost, *Separation of Church and State in the United States* (University of Minnesota Press, 1948), pp. 11-12.
4. *United States Supreme Court Reports* (Lawyers Co-operative Publishing Company, 1948). Vol. 92, Law. ed., pp. 638, 659.
5. *Idem*, p. 659.
6. Adams and Van Nest, *The Record of America* (C. Scribner's Sons, 1937), pp. 747-748.
7. V. T. Thayer, *Religion in Public Education* (Viking Press, 1947), Chapter II.
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 658.
9. *Op. cit.*, p. 666.

10. Johnson and Yost, *op. cit.*, p. 148.
11. Horace M. Kallen, *The Education of Free Men* (Farrar, Strauss and Co., 1949), p. 216.
12. Paul Blanchard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (Beacon Press, 1949), pp. 48-51.
13. Horace M. Kallen, *op. cit.*, p. 212.
14. *Christian Century*, (October 5, 1949), p. 1159.
15. Johnson and Yost, *loc. cit.*
16. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, *op. cit.*, p. 661.
17. Luther Weigle, "Religion and Public Education," *American Council on Education Studies* (February, 1949), p. 34.
18. Mr. Justice McReynolds, *United States Supreme Court Reports*, 1926, vol. 69, Law. ed., p. 1078.

Church and State in Europe

WILLEM L. IETSWAART

In discussing the relation between church and state in Europe one is immediately confronted by the fact that on the European continent we find not one state but many states, each of which presents its own peculiar relation of church and state. Consequently, we shall have to leave many important phases of the European situation undiscussed, and shall only be able to concentrate on a few major problems. The widest variety of church-state relationships is found in Europe, from the firmly established churches in the Scandinavian countries and England to the complete separation of church and state in France. In this, Germany and Holland take a middle position, and in the Eastern European countries the state is controlling the churches more and more.

To understand the present situation better, it is important to survey the historical background briefly. Generally speaking, we can distinguish three types of relationship between church and state. The first type is that of an intimate relation between church and state, in the form of either a church-state or a state-church. The second type is characterized by a certain coordination of state and church and a relative independence of the church from the state. The third type is disestablishment, and the complete separation of church and state.

All three types have had their period of blossoming in the history of the European churches. And roughly speaking, the order in which they were listed is also the order in which they appeared in the history of the church. The church-state type was most dominant from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, but has since practically disappeared. This was the period in which the Pope was considered the head of all temporal powers as well as of the spiritual domain. It began with the collapse of the Roman empire and the rise of the papacy, and ended with the Renaissance and the rise of the modern state.

From then on the state assumed the leadership over the church, and the church began to depend on the state. This predominance of the state-church lasted in all its strength from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the state-church began to disappear (although remnants of the system remained), and was replaced by the second type of relationship between church and state, namely, the relative autonomy of the church and its independence from the state. The state refrains from interference in

the internal affairs of the church, but does not sever all ties with the church. This type of relationship grew in the past century, especially in Germany. The trend towards disestablishment, as it was manifest in this second type of relationship, reached its consummation in the complete separation of church and state. When one speaks of "complete" separation one always has to bear in mind that, strictly speaking, this is an impossibility since no state can ignore the church and vice versa. The separation of church and state was prepared for by the establishment of the principle of religious freedom and the neutrality of the state. On the European continent a thorough separation of church and state was achieved in France, in Belgium, and in Italy. In countries like Germany there first was a demand for complete separation, but the traditional ties between state and church were so strong that full separation was never achieved. In Germany a decisive step towards disestablishment took place in 1919. In the constitution of 1919 the expression is found: "There exists no state-church." Results of this separation were the freedom of worship for any religious group and the autonomy of the former state-church so that now it chooses its own officers without any influence of the state. Yet certain ties with the church remained: support of the church by taxes, and special privileges and protection granted to the church by the state.

The preceding survey has necessarily been very general and inadequate. The European continent manifests such a wide variety of church and state relationships that it is impossible to treat them as a unity. Moreover, the situation in many countries is extremely fluid and unpredictable. But the purpose of our survey is to point out that, on the one hand, in hardly any continental country can we speak of a state-church in the traditional sense of the word, while, on the other hand, in only a few countries is the separation carried through consistently, and in most countries certain ties between state and church remain.

I

Thus far in our survey of the historical background of the present situation we have seen the gradual change from state-churches to forms of independent churches, or even to full separation of church and state. Another factor which is a necessary element for an understanding of the present situation is the rise of the totalitarian state. Tendencies toward a totalitarian state are found in all European countries as well as in the United States.

The tremendous technical development has made for a centralization of power and the need of a powerful state to control the forces of a machine society. The state regulates and controls many phases of society formerly held in private hands. The totalitarian state found its actual manifestation in the national socialism of Germany, the fascism of Italy, and the communism of Russia. The full-blown totalitarian state claims to control and direct the whole life of the community and the private lives of individuals. Such a state demands an ultimate allegiance, it claims man in the totality of his being, and thus becomes a religious institution, a pseudo church.

That the church was aware of the menace of the totalitarian state was evident from the place which the problem of church and state occupied at the Oxford Conference of 1937 which dealt with the subject, "Church, Community and State." The conference expressed the need for the church to repent before God. It realized that the church had in many ways failed to be a true community of believers. It saw in the rise of the totalitarian states an expression of the widespread longing for community, a longing which the church had not been able to meet and to satisfy. Amidst the disintegration of social forms and the atomism brought about by a technical civilization, the state became for many an all-inclusive community giving meaning to the nameless multitudes and uniting them into a powerful body.

But this recognition of its sin and guilt did not lead the church to passivity. At Oxford the church denounced the totalitarian state as a threat to the human personality, as it is understood by the Christian faith. The church expressed the need of witnessing where the state violated human personality, truth, and justice.

Our discussion of the church's attitude to the totalitarian state leads us to a brief consideration of the conflict which broke out between the church and the national socialistic state under Hitler. A large part of the German church did not recognize the threat of national socialism. These so-called "German Christians" saw in Hitler's rise to power God's hand lifting Germany from its state of disgrace. The year 1933 became to them a new revelation of God in history. The "German Christians" thought they could reconcile the Gospel with national socialism. This ideal of synthesis had been prepared for by German liberalism which was a theology of synthesis between religion and culture. In that hour Karl Barth became the prophet to save the Gospel from its acute secularization in national socialism. Barth's theology of "diastasis" was the only adequate weapon against the heresy of the German Christians. Though at first Barth thought that he could maintain his theology under Hitler just as he had done before, he soon began to realize that national socialism was a threat to the very existence of the church. In his pamphlet, "The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day," 1938, he unmasked national socialism as a false religion, an anti-church towards which the church of Jesus Christ could not remain neutral, but against which it had to fight to death. In 1933 writing his "Theological Existence Today," he still thought that the church should remain neutral towards Hitler and give his political experiment a chance. In 1938, the "today" no longer called for passivity but for action and resistance. In its anti-Semitism Barth saw the clearest mark of the religious anti-

Christian character of national socialism ("Anti-Semitism is sin against the Holy Ghost"). From 1938 to 1945 in pamphlets and letters, Barth carried on a passionate campaign against national socialism, and was instrumental in opening the eyes of many who had previously been blind to the dangers of the totalitarian state.

We have given special attention to Barth, first, because of his significance in the German struggle between church and state, but secondly, also, because we will have to compare his former attitude towards national socialism with his present attitude towards communism. Barth, however, was not the only one to see the dangers of the Hitler regime; the confessional church in Germany with men like Niemöller fought the national socialistic demon till the end.

II

With the liquidation of national socialism one chapter of the present struggle between church and state in Europe was closed, but it is not likely to have been the last chapter. The threat of the totalitarian state continues to exist in the form of communism. In Eastern Europe the tension between church and state is growing; and the lot of the church is very uncertain. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Eastern European situation occupied the attention of church leaders at the Amsterdam Assembly. Three men spoke on the condition of the church in Europe: Dean Hogsbrö, Bishop Dibelius, and Dr. Hromádka. Dean Hogsbrö surveys the situation in the Northern and Western evangelical countries of Europe. He calls attention to two chief characteristics of these countries: in the first place, the church enjoys full religious liberty, and secondly, in most of these countries the church is established and thereby officially related to the state. Though this situation is not seriously challenged by either the state or the churches themselves, yet the situation is problematic and unstable. The secularization of both state and society undermines the foundation on which establishment rests. A religiously neutral state has no essential relation to the church. Hogsbrö mentions another factor which has weakened the principle of "establishment," namely, the growing consciousness of the church of its own peculiarity, the sense that she (the church) is not the nation in the religious aspect, but that she is the fellowship of believers in Jesus Christ with allegiance only to him and not to any state, so that a relation to the state is not essential to her nature. These considerations lead Hogsbrö to think that the church-state relation even in the Western and Northern countries is by no means stable and may well become an issue in the near future. Here Hogsbrö touches on a very significant point in the contemporary continental situation. In Europe one can no longer speak of Christian nations and a Christian civilization. The churches are islands amidst a hostile sea of a secularized, paganized culture. Europe itself has become a mission field. Many are of the opinion that this is the end of the *corpus christianum*, the Christian civilization which began with the conversion of Constantine 1600 years ago.

Bishop Dibelius, who was another speaker on the European situation, lays great emphasis on the above fact. He says, "There are no Christian nations today. There are only Christian people." In many parts of Europe the churches have lost their privileged position, their protection by the state. They have been greatly im-

poverished, and have lost buildings, support, and properties. But, on the other hand, these churches have gained a new spiritual strength. They are more truly congregations of the living Lord, relying no longer on worldly privileges but only on Jesus Christ their Lord.

Hromadka, the third speaker at Amsterdam on the European situation, brings this out more clearly than anyone else. He contrasts the prestige and security of the established church under Franz Joseph I with the threatened existence of the church in his native country today. But Hromadka sees a definite gain in this change of situation. He remarks, "But the church of Christ has become much more relevant. She has ceased to be a decoration of life, a relic from the past. . . The church is returning to her true mission, to be a fellowship of those who have been rescued and brought back into the obedience of Jesus Christ." In his report for Commission Number IV, Hromadka stresses the fact that the church is not at home in any historical situation, that she is a pilgrim on this earth. He urges the church not to identify herself with any group or worldly power, but "to go beyond the present, national, political, and 'block' divisions."

These words of Hromadka lead us to the controversial problem of the church-state relationship in Eastern Europe. As is well known, Hromadka himself believes that Christians should cooperate with the communistic regime and give it their loyal support. According to him the Western nations are morally and politically exhausted, the Western bourgeoisie lacks "the political skill, wisdom and strength of convictions to rule our countries (the Eastern European) and to overcome the terrific chaos that would follow the breakdown of the Soviets." He is not blind to the danger of Russian imperialism, but still holds that communism offers a constructive approach to the social and economic problems of our day, and that the socialization achieved in Eastern Europe was long overdue. Communism simply may not be equated with totalitarianism.

III

Hromadka's position has evoked much debate and controversy. In this Barth and Brunner disagree concerning the attitude which the church should take towards the communistic states of eastern Europe. Brunner's position is an unequivocal rejection of communism. Communism, as we know it, is a form of totalitarianism; and any form of the totalitarian state is atheistic and anti-Christian, because by definition it claims man in his totality. Barth, however, is rather favorably disposed towards the communistic experiment in Eastern Europe. The controversy came into the open when Barth published his impressions of a trip to Hungary in 1948, in which he praised the Reformed church leaders in Hungary, who do not in principle reject the policy of communism in their country and do not oppose the regime as such. The present task of the Hungarian church is to stick to the preaching of the Gospel and to wait and see how things develop. The church should resist the state, wherever a critical situation arises. Such a situation arose with the growth of national socialism, but such a situation has not, as yet, arisen with regard to communism. The church does not deal with timeless isms and systems but with events, with historical realities. She does not judge according to "principles" but judges each case separately. Here Barth's theology comes out

clearly as the background of his political attitude. The Word of God does not give us general principles by which we can judge movements but the Word comes to the church as an event in the concrete situation and then and there compels the church to speak. 1934 was such a concrete situation, 1948 is not. National socialism was an entirely different phenomenon from present day communism. Brunner, attacking Barth's position, does not see any essential difference between the totalitarianism of national socialism and of communism. In totalitarianism, whether its color is brown or red, Brunner sees the greatest threat to humanity today. The church may not compromise with it in any form. The fact that the communistic states have achieved certain economic reforms does not change their basically evil nature.

The fundamental disagreement between Barth and Brunner brings out the perplexing nature of the situation in Eastern Europe. It is very difficult to gain a clear view of the situation, as it actually is. Moreover, the situation is changing continually. There are in communism two elements: a constructive attempt to reorder the structure of society, and its totalitarian character. Barth and Hromadka stress the first element, the positive contribution of communism, while Brunner and many others consider its totalitarianism as basically incompatible with the Christian faith.

Whatever stand churches may take, they should not identify themselves with any social group and its interests. They should recognize the need of the social reforms brought about by communism. Protestantism should beware not to fall into the dilemma: catholicism or communism. Some Protestants commit the absurdity of calling Cardinal Mindszenty a true Calvinist. Mindszenty stood for the feudalistic past and a reactionary regime. When the church is deprived of its privileged economic position and its lands taken away, we should not call this religious persecution.

In closing we want to call attention to what Dr. Visser 'tHooft has proposed as the task of the church in Europe, namely, the search for a "third way." The church should not accept the either-or of East and West. Visser 'tHooft says that the Christians today, like the early Christians, should break through the accepted categories of our time and show new powers towards the solution of the social problems. He here expresses the mind of many Christians in Europe today who feel they should look for a third way not between but beyond the two powers of East and West.

RECENT BOOKS FOR YOUR READING

- Aulen, FAITH OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, 1948
- Baah, THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, 1949
- Barth, TEACHING OF THE CHURCH REGARDING BAPTISM, 1948
- Blackwood, PASTORAL LEADERSHIP, 1949
- Carlson, THE REINTERPRETATION OF LUTHER, 1948
- Denney, LETTERS OF PRINCIPAL JAMES DENNEY TO W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, 1920
- Dicks, MY FAITH LOOKS UP, 1949
- Haroutunian, LUST FOR POWER, 1949
- Micklem, DOCTRINE OF OUR REDEMPTION, 1948
- Niebuhr, FAITH AND HISTORY, 1949
- Patrick, PASCAL AND KIERKEGAARD, 1948
- Phillips, LETTERS TO YOUNG CHURCHES, 1948
- Spann, THE MINISTRY, 1949
- Weatherhead, WHEN THE LAMP FLICKERS, 1948

Seminary Highlights

The Christmas vacation ended on January 3 when classes were resumed. There was little opportunity for nostalgia on the part of the students, for final examinations enlivened seminary life from January 18 to January 21. But as must all devices of men, the examinations came to an end and the spring semester began on January 24.

Two new students enrolled for the second semester. They are Earl Kragt, a 1949 graduate of Hope College, and Dean Veltman, who will graduate from Hope in June.

On January 25 Dr. Cornelius R. Wierenga, '23, of the Arcot Theological Seminary in India, presented a discussion on contemporary India. Dr. Wierenga's lecture was both informative and challenging.

The faculty and students of the seminary were privileged to attend the Hope College mid-year commencement exercises on February 7. Dr. Joseph R. Sizoo, president of New Brunswick Theological Seminary, delivered an address entitled "The Modern Dilemma."

The seminary benefited from the meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions in Holland February 8-10. Some of the meetings of the board were open to the public and, as a result, the students were able to witness that body in action. As a further result we were privileged to have special speakers in chapel. One of these visitors, Dr. Milton Stauffer, secretary of the Milton Society of the Blind, related his experiences on a recent world tour with Miss Helen Keller. Miss Ruth Ransom was another guest with an inspiring message.

President John R. Mulder conducted the Religious Emphasis Week of Monmouth College in Illinois the week of February 12-15.

Once again the faculty and students were guests of Hope College during the observance of the annual Religious Emphasis Week February 21-24. Dr. Jacob Prins, '27, Minister of Evangelism of the Reformed Church in America conducted the program with his theme "Some Campus Questions."

Through the efforts of the chapel committee the Tuesday morning chapel period has become an occasion of keen interest for the students. During recent months many graduates of Western have appeared to give brief inspirational talks. Those appearing have been the Rev. John Benes, '42, of Beechwood Church, Holland, the Rev. William De Jong, '33, of Hull, Iowa, the Rev. Joseph R. Esther, '38, now living in Holland, the Rev. Harvey Hoffman, '35, of Hackensack, New Jersey, the Rev. Cornelius G. Reynen, '42, of Bethel Church, Holland, the Rev. Harland Steele, '47, director of Temple Time, the Rev. Henry Van Dyke, '20, of Fourth Church, Holland, and the Rev. James Wayer, '04, of Holland.

On January 30 the Adelpia Society completed a course on the Book of Revelation with Dr. Albertus Pieters. As a token of their appreciation the members of the group presented to Dr. Pieters a reading lamp. The course of study for the spring semester is "The Mistress of the Manse." Mrs. Bastian Kruit-hof is conducting the study.

The Adelpic Society began the year with a new constitution and new officers. The society has continued to meet regularly and has been fortunate enough to secure many able speakers.

On January 10 three of our foreign students spoke on the subject, "What Does Your Country Expect of the American Church?" Otto Gründler from Germany, Peter Hsieh from China, and Antonio Moncada from Italy participated. Of

particular interest has been a series of four programs concerning the relationship of the ministry to various agencies of community life. On February 7 Mr. Christian Broek, an attorney and a Reformed Church layman from Muskegon, spoke on "The Law and the Prophets" or "The Relationship between the Ministry and the Law." The evening of February 14 Dr. William Moerdyk, late of Arabia and presently located in Holland, presented a lecture on "The Relationship between the Ministry and the Medical Profession." The following Tuesday Mrs. Mayo Hadden of the Ottawa County Department of Social Welfare offered much valuable information regarding the relationship of the ministry to social work. One of the most profitable meetings of the season was that of February 28 when Mr. Robert Notier, a local mortician, imparted some helpful suggestions concerning the relationship between the ministry and the undertaker. An added feature of this meeting was the presence of the Rev. Joseph Esther, who addressed himself briefly to the situation in China. Members of the faculty made the evening complete by providing refreshments during an hour of fellowship.

The evening of March 6 the Adelpic Society entertained the Alpha Chi Society, which is composed of pre-seminary students at Hope College. Dr. Tena Holkeboer, the guest speaker, shared some of her missionary experiences with the group. Refreshments and a period of fellowship concluded the evening.

We in the seminary have been privileged in recent weeks to enjoy the cream of Hope College's current oratorical crop. Burrell Pennings, Hope College Peace Orator, delivered an oration, "New Men for a New World," before the seminary group on January 6. Floyd Goulooz, the present College Orator at Hope, spoke on "Pioneers of Progress," on March 1.

Four members of the faculty have been conducting courses in the annual Lay Leadership Training Program at Hope College. Professor John R. Mulder is teaching a class in Adult work; Professor Lester J. Kuypers' course is related to Young People's work; Professor Richard C. Oudersluis is presenting "The Life and Letters of Paul;" and Professor George H. Menenga is lecturing on "The Old Testament Prophets and their Messages."

It has become customary for Professor L. Kuypers to go with the members of the senior class each year to Grand Rapids to visit various points of interest. On March 10 they visited the Church Herald office and then attended the worship service at the Reform synagogue.

The afternoon of March 13 the members of the seminary faculty and their wives entertained the local Reformed Church ministers and missionaries, together with their wives, in the social room of Zwemer Hall.

Recently Dr. D. Ivan Dykstra, '38, of Hope College, in two lectures outlined in a perspicuous manner some of the fundamental positions of Karl Barth. On March 8 he spoke on Barth's concept of revelation. One week later the subject was concerned with Barth's view of the Scriptures.

A sustained collective sigh reverberated through the corridors of Semelink Hall on March 16. March 15 is the deadline not only for federal income tax payments but also for B.D. theses; thus the sigh of relief by eight seniors. The names of the students and their thesis topics are as follows: Chester J. Droog, *The Israelite Religion and Its Canaanitish Neighbors*; Harold N. Englund, *Trends in Religious Epistemology*; Thomas M.

Groome, Jr., *Anabaptist Contributions to Our American Protestant Heritage*; Otto Gründler, *The Problem of the Fall and the Origin of Sin*; Warren Hietbrink, *A Study of Jesus and Law according to Matthew's Gospel*; Robert H. Schuller, *An Analytical Study of Calvin's Use of Bible Texts*; John A. Vander Waal, *The Place of the Individual in Kierkegaard*; and Donald Weemhoff, *Biblical Illustrations for Sermonizing*.

Alumni in Other Churches or Christian Work

Frederick J. Van Dyk, '15, of 235 South Sheldon Street, Charlotte, Michigan, is serving the N. W. Carmel Community Church of Charlotte.

L. Hekhuis, '16, is serving the Presbyterian Church at the University of Wichita, Wichita, Kansas.

Jacob J. Althuis, '17, of 7120 South Normal Boulevard, Chicago 21, Illinois, is now affiliated with the Presbyterian denomination in rescue mission work in Chicago.

Henry C. Jacobs, '17, of 129 Lowell Avenue, N. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan, is Educational Secretary of the Michigan Temperance Foundation. He travels throughout the state of Michigan in connection with his work among high school students.

Marinus Cook, '18, is living at 6573 Gardenia Avenue, Long Beach 5, California.

Herbert H. Wernecke, '20, of 475 East Lockwood, Webster Groves 19, Missouri, has been at Eden Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church since 1927, where he is Professor of Biblical Interpretation.

Adam J. Westmaas, '23, of 2008 Longfellow, Detroit, Michigan, is serving a Presbyterian Church in Detroit.

Francis P. Ihrman, '24, of 1527 College Avenue, Racine, Wisconsin, is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Racine. He is also chairman of National Missions for his Presbytery.

John H. Meengs, '25, of 417 Miami Club Drive, Mishawaka, Indiana, is serving the Presbyterian Church in Mishawaka.

Anthony Meengs, '26, of Tenth and North Avenue, Richmond, Indiana, is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Richmond and moderator of the Synod of Indiana.

Clarence Laman, '26, of 431 Delaware Avenue, Delanco, New Jersey, is superintendent of the Bible Presbyterian home for retired Christian workers.

Henry G. Korver, '27, of 441 Fillmore Street, Fillmore, California, is serving the Presbyterian Church in Fillmore. At present he is moderator of the Santa Barbara Presbytery.

John Rikkers, '28, of 526 High Street, Newport, Oregon, is pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Newport.

Leonard De Moor, '28, of 402 East Seventh Street, Hastings, Nebraska, is serving the Presbyterian Church at Hastings College.

Henry Voss, '28, of 319 North Center Street, Plymouth, Indiana, is serving the Evangelical and Reformed Church in Plymouth.

Frederick H. Olert, '29, of 39 Edmund Place, Detroit, Michigan, is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Detroit.

John F. Schortinghuis, '29, Boyden, Iowa, is serving the United Presbyterian Church in Boyden.

Onno J. Snuttjer, '29, is pastor of the Union Presbyterian Church of Stacyville, Iowa.

Again in recent weeks some of the students have been privileged to conduct a devotional program on WHTC, the Holland radio station.

The seminary basketball team has just completed its season of competition with various Hope College organizations. Although the record of the team was not indicative of conspicuous success, the participants enjoyed themselves.

A. J. Ungersma, '29, of 281 Crescent Road, San Anselmo, California, is serving the Presbyterian Church as Professor of Systematic Theology in the San Francisco Theological Seminary.

Herman E. Dirks, '29, is pastor of the Monticello Presbyterian Church in Monticello, Indiana.

Harold G. Arink, '30, is pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Rowley, Iowa.

Henry G. Bovenkerk, '30, Room 501, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, New York, is affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. In his position as executive secretary of the Interboard Committee for Christian Work in Japan, he is serving eight denominations.

Cornelius I. Wilkens, '30, is pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Castlewood, South Dakota.

Marion Nollen, '31, is serving the Presbyterian Church in Cambria, Wisconsin.

Leonard Greenway, '32, of 800 Otilia Street, S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan, is affiliated with the Christian Reformed denomination as school pastor of Grand Rapids Christian High School.

Harry Van't Kerkhof, '32, of 4050 North Second Street, Phoenix, Arizona, is a representative of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions at the Cook Christian Training School where he teaches Bible.

T. A. Mansen, '33, Hawarden, Iowa, is affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. He is serving the Associated Churches (Congregational and Presbyterian) of Hawarden.

Howard B. Scholten, '33, of 81 North Second Street, San Jose 18, California, is serving the Protestant Episcopal Church at Trinity Episcopal Church of San Jose.

Richard G. Elzinga, '33, of 9112 North Third Street, Phoenix, Arizona, is pastor of the Sunnyslope Presbyterian Church of Phoenix.

Frederick Wyngarden, '34, Weston at La Grave, S. E., Grand Rapids 2, Michigan, is pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church of Grand Rapids.

Herman J. Kregel, '35, is post chaplain of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

David H. Louwenaar, '37, of 1248 Ironton, Aurora, Colorado, is a chaplain at Fitzsimmons General Hospital in Denver.

James Z. Nettinga, '37, is Secretary of the American Bible Society for Southern California. His address is 325 Ramona Street, Pasadena.

Gysbert J. Ver Steeg, '38, is serving the Presbyterian Church at Campbell, Nebraska.

Willis N. Zenk, '42, Wilburton, Oklahoma, is serving the Home Missions Council at Eastern Oklahoma A and M College.

Oscar Jelsma, '42, Highland, New York, is serving the Presbyterian churches at Highland and Milton.

William H. Bos, '42, of Lebanon, Illinois, is teaching at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, while working toward a Ph.D. He is also supplying the First Presbyterian Church of Carlyle, Illinois.

Charles J. Stoppels, '45, has recently become the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Flint, Michigan.

C. John Westhof, '45, Whitesboro, Texas, is serving the Presbyterian Church in Whitesboro.

Egbert Lubbers, '45, of 818 North Cleveland, Sherman, Texas, is serving the Presbyterian Church at Austin College.

H. A. Hartmann, '46, is pastor of the Bethel Evangelical and Reformed Church of Marion, South Dakota. He is also supply pastor at Freeman, South Dakota.

John Gillesse, '47, of 201 Metz Apartments, Sioux City, Iowa, is associate minister and director of religious education of the First Presbyterian Church of Sioux City.

Wesley C. Dykstra, '47, has finished his residence for his doctorate and is now a member of the faculty of Muskingum College, United Presbyterian Church, New Concord, Ohio.

Book Reviews

The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism, by W. F. Flemington, London: S. P. C. K., 1948. Pp. 160. 10s 6d.

It is the author's contention that "baptismal practice is confused because baptismal theology is indefinite." He would help correct this condition by presenting a study of Christian baptism which "confines itself almost exclusively to the biblical evidence, and seeks above all, by a patient interrogation of the New Testament writers, to discover the earliest Christian belief and practice in relation to baptism and the authority on which this belief and practice rested" (Preface p. 7). This is unquestionably a very worthy objective.

The book, like all Gaul, is divided into three parts. The first part traces the antecedents of Christian baptism. It is a rather cautious study of Jewish washings, proselyte baptism, and John's baptism. Here the author also seeks to determine the relationship of the baptism of Christ to the baptismal practices of the New Testament Church. It is very surprising to note, however, that in a study which aims to "confine itself almost exclusively to the biblical evidence," the historicity and reliability of the biblical text should be doubted at several points (pp. 26-30).

The second part of the book is an inductive study of the Acts of the Apostles, the Pauline and the Johannine writings. The Acts of the Apostles lead Flemington to the conclusion "that from the earliest days of the Church a rite of baptism with water was recognized mode of entry into the Christian Community. . . . This baptism is associated with 'repentance' and 'remission of sins'." It is therefore "a concrete embodiment of apostolic preaching" (p. 50). In his analysis of the Pauline teaching on baptism, however, we detect the author's first attempt to make out a case for baptismal regeneration. "For St. Paul baptism was far more than a highly dramatic means of preaching the Gospel. In baptism itself something happened. The symbolism was not only expressive but also effective" (p. 82).

The author makes his position unmistakably clear when he concludes from Johannine writings that "Christian baptism is the means whereby, through the outward uses of water and through the inward agency of the Spirit, a man is 'born from above,' and so enabled to enter the Kingdom of God." From other New Testament references he concludes that "baptism is the means whereby men are 'born again' and experience the 'renewing' power of the Holy Spirit" (p. 110).

This position need not be refuted here. It is sufficient to say that the author fails to distinguish between the water of baptism and the water of the Word. The instruments by which God regenerates men are the Word and the Spirit, not baptism and the Spirit. (Eph. 5:25, 26, I Pet. 1:23 and Titus 3:5). The Church fathers knew this when they wrote article xxiv of *The Confession of Faith*, (*The Belgic Confession*), "We be-

lieve that this true faith being wrought in man by the bearing of the Word of God, and the operation of the Holy Spirit, doth regenerate and make him a new man, causing him to live a new life, and freeing him from the bondage of sin."

The last section of the book deals with the authority behind Christian baptism. Inasmuch as the author rejects Matt. 28:19-20 as a record of the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, he must find the authority for baptism elsewhere. He believes, however, that baptism was "ordained by Christ himself." There is no other credible explanation for the early Christian practice of the rite.

The closing chapter deals with infant baptism. He seeks to tone down a bit the absolute language of the Book of Common Prayer which in the baptismal form says, "This child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church." If by "regeneration" we refer to "the first beginnings of the new life . . . and to the status of those who are received within the covenant" then the author is satisfied that this word should remain in the form for infant baptism (p. 141).

Later this proves to be a bit embarrassing to the author as he endeavors to explain why this new life sometimes fails to come to fruition. Does God fail in his purpose? Can the new life once begun be snuffed out? Flemington thinks so, forgetting Phil. 1:6. Here he demonstrates one of the inconsistencies inherent in the teaching of baptismal regeneration.

—THEODORE SCHAAP

Christianity and Civilization, by Emil Brunner. Volume I, *Foundations*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. Pp. xi—167. \$2.50. Volume II, *Specific Problems*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949. Pp. ix—147. \$2.50.

Christianity and Civilization consists of two series of the famous Gifford Lectures, those for 1947 and 1948. The two series have been published in separate volumes, but it is to be hoped that eventually they will appear in one volume. Some who may have been frightened by what they may have heard about theology, particularly on the continent — that it is inherently and necessarily dry and abstract and ponderous—will welcome the information that the material is here presented in an impressively clear and simple and concise manner. Brunner has done a magnificent job of treating profound themes in a manner which should be eminently intelligible and stimulating even to anyone with no more than an undergraduate preparation in philosophy, and perhaps even to a thinking layman. A quick glance at the titles of the lectures will show that he neither seeks refuge from frighteningly basic problems by dealing in trivialities, nor from distressingly concrete problems by dealing in comfortably abstract ones. After an introductory lecture on the Problem of a Christian Civilization, the first series, on "Foundations," deals with the problems of Being, Truth, Time, Meaning, Man

in the Universe, Personality and Humanity, Justice, Freedom, and Creativity. The second series, on "Specific Problems," includes lectures on Technics, Science, Tradition, Education, Work, Art, Wealth, Social Custom and Law, Power, and a concluding lecture on the Christian Idea of Civilization and Culture.

Brunner defines civilization as "the sum of productions and productive forces by which human life transcends the animal or vital sphere of self-preservation and preservation of the species" (p. 10). Then he presupposes that the kind of civilization which men develop is determined by three factors. The first includes all "natural factors like formation of country, climate, possibilities of maintenance, within which, as a given frame, human life has to develop." The second set of factors includes "the physical and spiritual equipment of men within a given area. . . . their physical and spiritual forces, their vitality, their energy, and their talent." The third set of factors consists of the spiritual presuppositions of a religious and ethical character which, not in themselves cultural, we might call the culture—transcendent presuppositions of every culture" (pp. 10f). It is this third area which, according to Brunner, is of decisive importance in determining whether a given culture is Christian. Consequently his book is concerned with some basic questions which arise in this area of the presuppositions of religious and ethical nature.

His procedures in each lecture are fairly uniform. In general he approaches each subject by pointing out a pair of mutually antithetical alternatives and then shows how the Christian position avoids the errors involved in both the alternatives. It is an interesting and important indication of the crisis quality of our times, that in so many respects we stand at the point where such alternatives have obviously been either exhausted or worked out to an *absurdum*; hence, the need to arrive at some basically new presuppositions. As Brunner claims, this new, needed position is in each instance implicit in some aspect of a Christian outlook. In other lectures, he proceeds by showing the basic weakness of an existing presupposition and then demonstrating how the position has originated in an earlier acceptance of a position which was at variance with the Christian. In his first volume particularly, the author shows that he has made himself at home in the history of great ideas not only, but that he has seen how ideas are related to each other and in turn to historical development. In like manner, the second volume reveals a stimulating insight into relatively more tangible issues of modern life, an awareness that each of these needs to be answered at the level of ultimate principle, and that each *can* be answered significantly.

It would be an excess of enthusiasm which would regard these lectures as the embodiment of a final answer to the ever-present and, I think, ever-changing, problem of the relation between Christianity and civilization. Brunner would certainly be among the last to claim that it could be called that. It is rather to be valued as a trail-blazing book which indicates a fairly new and enticing conception of the task confronting the Christian faith and of the fundamental relevance of Christianity to every area of life. Formally, that is the important creative feature of the lectures. It is not just a repetition of collected traditions, but a refreshingly new and far-reaching expression of what has often been claimed as a basic Protestant principle, so often all but obscured in its history, that the Christian faith is not accidentally but essentially relevant and to be related to the concrete problems of specifically human existence. Entirely aside from the question, therefore, whether one is going to accept the positions of Brunner as outlined here, these volumes should perform a much needed service in arousing interest in

the vast project of determining whether Christianity is really relevant and what that relevance is. The lectures may also represent at least the beginning of a meaningfully affirmative answer to the question whether Protestantism has a philosophy or not—a question which has had to be answered rather consistently in the negative. In its orthodox main-line development Protestantism has tended, for better or worse, to throw the weight of its interest more upon the content of a theology than upon the problem of relating that theology to basic problems. The result is that it has not been very directly interested in the development of a philosophy. In its more liberal development, Protestantism has been too hodge-podge and confused and not clearly enough based upon specifically Protestant or Christian presuppositions to be called meaningfully Protestant or philosophical. It is not Brunner's aim, one can be sure, to turn Christianity into a philosophy; and yet he has recognized the abiding need of making the basic meanings and implications of Protestantism articulate in terms which are relevant and redemptive for culture. At the same time that he was performing this service, he was successfully pointing out that some of the tenets of theology, which are sometimes presupposed to be so abstract as to be meaningless, are really highly relevant in determining the kind of culture in which men must live.

Brunner has left an astonishingly few loopholes in his position. For those who might fear that he might prove to be guilty of emasculating Christianity by compelling it to serve this somewhat more menial purpose of shoring up the structure of civilization, there is assurance, expressed unambiguously in the closing lecture, that "the gospel of the redemption and salvation of the world in Jesus Christ is not meant to be a programme for any kind of civilization or culture. . . . The gospel of Jesus Christ is the revelation of . . . (man's) destiny beyond and above historical life. . . . That is why the first and main concern of the Christian can never be civilization and culture. . . . God has created man for both this world and the world to come. He therefore made him capable of creating civilization and culture and gave him a final destiny beyond them. It is the knowledge of this final destiny which makes Christianity capable of giving civilization and culture an element which otherwise they do not have. . . . (This element) is entirely the outcome of that faith and hope which have their roots as well as their aim beyond history" (II, pp. 140ff). Though this appears in a kind of epilogue to the lectures, it must be considered to be one of the basic elements in Brunner's outlook. It is this understanding that saves his work from many possible pitfalls into which it might otherwise have run. He thus saves himself from conceiving of Christianity as essentially translatable into a philosophy, so that we should have a philosophy and nothing more. It also saves him from the danger of so immersing Christianity in the project of providing the framework for the construction of culture that it would be nothing more than a device for constructing a culture. And by recognizing that the roots as well as the aim of Christianity are beyond history, he spares himself the criticism of being still basically and at heart a rationalist, in the assumption that the only thing that is needed by culture for its Christianization is that men adopt a new set of propositions and presto! the change will be there.

There are certain points in the argument at which questions need to be raised, at least, even if on analysis it appears that these cannot be taken as fundamentally defensible criticisms. The first of these questions is whether the positions which Brunner offers as Christian position are really Christian, and, if so, whether they have hitherto been recognized as the specific Christian position on these issues. This question arises,

for instance, in connection with his consideration of the Christian concept of personality. To him "the Christian foundation of personality (is) in divine election, in the personal call of the personal God" (I, p. 98). This he refers to as "the transcendent basis of personality." That idea is, of course, not new, and it cannot be objected to on the ground that it is a completely meaningless conception. But it may be questioned whether this is what election really meant in the first instance, and whether this is not adapting the original concept of election to serve a purpose which is quite foreign to its initial intent. What has apparently happened is that the need arose for a new expression of the genuine basis of personality in the thought of Christianity. This need was then rather arbitrarily met by a reinterpretation of the concept of election—an interpretation for which there seems to me to be no basis in Biblical thought on election. Why not a reference here to the transcendent basis of human personal existence in the creation, and of human personal dignity and worth in the creation and in the redemptive act? This appears to be an instance where Brunner has simply assumed that a concept which is scholastic in its origin is the unquestioned Christian position.

This is an instance of what seems to be a fairly frequent tendency in Brunner. He presupposes that the Christian position is definable without any question, and overlooks the fact that in its actual development Christianity has identified itself at particular junctures of historical development with the various positions which he now lists as antithetical to Christianity. Christianity has been identified in its turn with idealism and rationalism, and some of its unquestionably creative moments have been characterized by an identification of Christianity with some form of subjectivism. It may be a very proper thing to point out what appears to be the unmistakably Christian position from one's present vantage point. But it must not be overlooked that some of these positions are for the first time in this current situation obviously Christian. In earlier situations it was not possible to see them as such. What underlies Brunner's thinking at several points is, therefore, this too superficial assumption that the content of the Christian culture-transcendent factors has been fairly constant. He overlooks the fact that there are many features involved which are definitely a new interpretation of Christianity in the new light which is thrown upon its nature by contemporary circumstances.

A question closely akin to this is the question whether Brunner is right in judging the history of the development of ideas in the tone in which he does so. It cannot be laid simply to the fact that in lectures of this type there is no room for detailed analysis of the development of ideas, that he oversimplifies his judgments of the historical development and fails frequently to see that the positions which he criticizes were originally taken in the best of faith and with an irreproachable awareness that in their particular situations they were genuinely Christian. It is superficial to judge Erasmus adversely simply because he stands in a line of development which issues in Feuerbach, Strauss and Marx. True, we can now see what Erasmus' principle did not contain adequate safeguards against that kind of development. But we cannot blame Erasmus for failure to see what could not be seen until a few hundred years had elapsed. What is more, Brunner can now blame Erasmus for departing from a sound Christian basis for the conception of the essence of personality; but the fact is that that Christian basis was not and could not have been understood as adequately by Erasmus in his situation as it can now be understood by Brunner in his. To judge historical positions in the light of what they eventually become, frequently by deliberate perversion of their original principle, is a fascinating exercise but

hardly a good reading of history.

And that raises a third question. Do these culture-transcendent factors really constitute for man an area of freedom, in the sense that we can choose freely between one set and another? I think there is some room to doubt that this area is as much subject to freedom as Brunner seems to suggest. Ideas are not formed in a vacuum and decisions between various possible alternative ideas are not made in arbitrary freedom. Man's freedom in this area is limited in part by his ignorance of just what is the right idea to choose in the particular situation, and also by his ignorance of what others who come after him may do with his idea. But more important than that, ideas follow history as largely as they shape it, and there is an organic character about the development of ideas in the sense that one grows out of and is in large measure determined by the preceding thought-contexts. God himself may be able to inject ideas suddenly and *de novo* into the situation, but man is not so gifted. His decisions in the world of ideas are not purely rational—if they were he could make these decisions freely. They are determined in part by the need of reaction against an idea that has proved itself to be impossible, or of continuing and developing further an idea which has proved itself to be relatively acceptable. Man just does not sit down and calmly make a decision to exchange one pattern of ideas for another; and even if he could, there would be good reason to question whether the new set of ideas so adopted would be adopted with sufficient passion to become significant for him. The great and effective and determining ideas are those which are thrust upon man, not those which he reaches out to pluck from among several possibilities.

—D. IVAN DYKSTRA

Can Protestantism Win America? by Charles Clayton Morrison, New York: Harper & Brothers. 1948. Pp. viii—225. \$2.50.

In April and May of 1946 there appeared in the *Christian Century* from the pen of Charles Clayton Morrison a series of articles entitled, "Can Protestantism Win America?" As editor he was challenged to this task by a series of articles of associate editor Harold E. Fey on the subject, "Can Catholicism Win America?" The articles by both men produced much thought and comment. Morrison was stimulated to expand and revise his material for the present volume, *Can Protestantism Win America?*

A survey of the chapter headings reveals the line of Morrison's thought. A few representative chapter titles will convey this to those who read this review: "How Strong Is Protestantism?" "Protestantism and the Public School," "Protestantism and Science," "Protestantism and Commercialized Entertainment," "The Protestant Task," "Protestant Localism," "Protestantism's Misuse of the Bible," "The Concept of an Ecumenical Protestantism," and "Protestantism and the Lordship of Christ."

The first six chapters represent the author's diagnosis of present day Protestantism. He stresses the point that Roman Catholicism, Secularism and Protestantism are the three big contenders for America. The real strength of Protestantism must be measured not only by quantitative strength, but also in terms of its qualitative and relative strength. He deplores denominational "cheer leaders" who proclaim the forward strides of particular churches without recognizing the weaknesses of Protestantism.

Morrison has made an excellent study of the comparative strength between present day and nineteenth century Protestantism. His analysis of secularism and its influence in re-shaping

POSTMASTER—If undeliverable as addressed, for any reason, please notify sender, stating reason and giving new address if known, on Form 3547, postage for which is guaranteed.

life for the individual should be read by every minister. Secularism is described as a deadly force, the opposite to Christianity.

The author proceeds to discuss the influence of secularism, as it affects the church in the area of the public school, science, and commercialized entertainment. These three chapters are worth the price of the book. The writer maintains that our public education has "created the mind-set of generation after generation" (p. 17), and that the mentality of our citizenship has been neutralized on the basis of virtual ignorance of Christian faith and of religion in general. Modern education, according to its own claims, must interpret the life of the community and the world for the school child; but, says Morrison, the schools have blind spots on the question of religion. "Protestantism cannot long maintain its position in American life while it allows its children to grow up in religious illiteracy. Its devotion to the public school gives it the right to demand that the ban on religion in the curriculum be removed" (p. 31).

The discussion of science by the author shows his understanding of our times. Science has risen to power, rendering a service of inestimable value to the Christian faith in that it has "compelled theology to think with new imagery of God's relation to both nature and history" (p. 33). Morrison also warns us that, "If Protestantism is to win America from secularism, it must win science" (p. 33). A few of his sentences reveal his analysis. "Our educational system has fragmented and atomized our American culture. . . The world lies in chaos because it lacks devotion to the living God who alone can create a world community. . . No solution of the predicament of man in the atomic age seems possible except one which is found at the deep level of religious faith" (p. 38).

Chapter Five, "Protestantism and Commercialized Entertainment," is a "must" chapter for the real understanding of our problem in winning America for Christ. Morrison's discussion of entertainment with respect to its essential character, its nation-wide coverage, and its real purpose is illuminating and true to the facts. He shows with clarity how the modern mind has been influenced by the world of entertainment. "The incessant bombardment of the mind with sensuous stimuli has subtly, but profoundly, changed the quality of the mentality of our generation" (pp. 51, 52). "This commercialized, ready-to-wear entertainment tends downward toward vulgarity and profanity" (p. 53). "Our commercialized entertainment system is producing a mentality of escape from the deeper and more ultimate issues of life" (p. 54). "Technique has become the idol of education, of the arts and of entertainment, while subject matter has been thrust into a secondary, if not a negligible, place" (p. 55).

Protestantism is also discussed in relation to Roman Catholicism. He cites facts to show that the Roman Catholic Church proceeds on a "bold and highly intelligent strategy," in order to make its organization "consciously secure in its position in American society" (p. 60). Morrison enumerates nine evidences of Roman Catholic technique in America.

Morrison continues his exposition of the weakness of Protestantism in a series of short propositions which he discusses in chapters eight through eleven. These are his propositions: 1. "Protestantism is being victimized by a false tolerance" (p. 91); 2. "Protestantism is handicapped by its names" (p. 95); 3. "Protestantism thinks in categories that are too small to express either the richness or the power of the Christian faith" (p. 96); 4. "Protestantism has never developed a conscience on the unity that is in Christ" (p. 99); 5. "Protestantism is weak at its base, namely, its local churches" (p. 102); 6. "Protestantism has lacked the will to be strong" (p. 115); and 7. "Protestantism is bedeviled by its unscriptural use of the Scriptures" (p. 130). Morrison presents some excellent arguments in defense of these propositions, although he has carried his criticism of number six entirely too far. In number seven he has virtually eclipsed the Protestant position on the Bible in relation to Christ.

In the remaining chapters of the book, chapters twelve through sixteen, the author presents his concept of the ecumenical church in its ideal organization and function. He boldly claims that Protestantism has not won America and that the only way it can win America is by means of an ecumenical church. By this ecumenical church he means a super-church. A single organic union, according to Morrison, can best be effected through the present Federal Council of Churches in a merger of denominations. The final and complete organization of the true "Ecumenical Church of Christ" with the functions of baptism, education, missions, and the Lord's Supper, and with a minimum of beliefs is for Morrison the solution of Protestantism. "Only such a church can provide for the religious resources needed to gather up the fragments of a shattered civilization and with them build a new society" (p. 219).

I recommend that ministers and laymen buy this book for personal reading. Morrison's analysis of many of the weaknesses of Protestantism is excellent and shows keenness of insight. He has not covered all the weaknesses of Protestantism, and in my estimation, he has failed to mention the most essential difficulties. Morrison does not mention such Protestant weaknesses as a waning interest in the spiritual Gospel, the needed emphasis on repentance, the importance of a clear-cut belief in Christ Jesus, the Son of Man and the Son of God, and the need for pentecostal revival. Without these weaknesses examined and removed, Protestantism cannot hope to win America for Christ.

Morrison manifests a tragic weakness. He becomes lost in a maze when he seeks a super-church with Christ as Lord, because he interprets authority and the Bible according to liberal and personal inclinations.

This book opens one's eyes to some of the lurking foes of Protestantism usually not noticed by conservative thinkers. The book will stimulate the reader to be more determined than ever to witness concerning the cross of Christ, and the full Gospel presented in the Bible, and to feel the need for a God-sent revival so that Protestantism may win America.

—WILLIAM GOULOOZE

E
H.
20
A.

Protes-
ses in
tions:
rance"
ames"
e too
Chris-
ped a
Protes-
102);
115);
of the
argu-
arried
seven
ble in

welve
meni-
boldly
at the
enical
nurch.
be ef-
in a
ization
ctions
and
on of
e re-
shat-
219).
k for
weak-
of in-
utism,
st es-
stant
, the
ar-cut
God,
esses
win

st in
Lord,
o lib-

es of
The
than
full
or a

ZE